



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,120	10/05/2001	Dung H. Nguyen	RIC-00-045	3675

25537 7590 09/16/2003

WORLD COM, INC.
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT
1133 19TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SANGHAVI, HEMANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2874

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/972,120

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN, DUNG H.

Examiner

Hemang Sanghavi

Art Unit

2874

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 7, 12, 15-19, 22, 25, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Csipkes et al (US 5,724,127).

Csipkes et al discloses a borescope having a borescope insertion tube and an optical lens; and a borescope insertion tube adapter for adapting the borescope insertion tube to an optical component to be inspected. See Figs. 4-6 and lines 54-66 of column 5 through lines 1-36 of column 6. As to claims 7, 15, 22, and 30, embodiments of Figs. 4-6 discuss the adapter being an SC, FC, and E2000 component type.

As to claims 12 and 27, Csipkes et al discloses a light emitter for illuminating a target of the optical component to be inspected. See Fig. 7, reference numeral 188.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Csipkes et al.

Csipkes et al, as discussed above, fails to disclose a protective sleeve disposed between the borescope insertion tube and the adapter body and a lock for securing the protective sleeve to the borescope insertion tube.

However, as noted with respect to Fig. 4, Csipkes et al discloses an inner rectangular opening for securing the SC adapter body positioned between the borescope insertion tube and the adapter body. Also providing such protection through a protection sleeve and a locking mechanism of the protection sleeve are well known in the art. The ordinary artisan would have found desirable to provide a protection sleeve with locking mechanism in the reference of Csipkes et al reference for the purpose of efficiently securing the protecting the adapter body.

Thus, the ordinary artisan would have been it obvious at the time of the invention to provide a protection sleeve and a lock mechanism for the protection sleeve in Csipkes et al reference for the purpose of advantageously increasing mechanical strength of the inspection device.

Claims 8-9 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Csipkes et al and applicant's admitted prior art of Figs. 6A-6E.

Csipkes et al, as discussed above, fails to disclose a shutter on the optical component and the adapter body for actuating the shutter.

Figs. 6A-6E of applicant's admitted prior art discloses a shutter means and actuating means for actuating the shutter upon insertion. Such device is well known in the art to protect the optical fiber from dust.

From teachings of applicant's admitted prior art and available well-known techniques, the ordinary artisan would have found it to be obvious at the time of the invention to provide an actuation means on the adapter of Csipkes et al for the purpose of advantageously inspecting the optical connectors provided with the shutter.

Claims 10-11, 13-14, 26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Csipkes et al.

Csipkes et al ('127) fails to disclose a video camera for capturing the images and the adapter body is configured such that the borescope insertion tube is maneuverable.

Csipkes et al ('285) teaches the use of a video camera for capturing the images. See lines 16-68 of column 5. Csipkes et al ('285) also teaches to provide a maneuverable insertion tube such that all the optical components in a rack can be inspected. Also note, '285 teaches to use the adapter assembly of '127 in the embodiment of the invention (see lines 30-35 of column 4).

From collective teachings of '285 and '127, the ordinary artisan would have found it to be obvious at the time of the invention to provide a video camera for capturing the image and a maneuverable tube for the purpose of advantageously providing a versatile and efficient inspection system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dominique and Horwitz et al disclose different types of inspection devices.

Art Unit: 2874

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hemang Sanghavi whose telephone number is 703-305-3484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:30 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick can be reached on 703-308-4819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Hemang Sanghavi
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2874

hs